

Remarks

A. Claims in the Case

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, and 35-43 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, and 35-39 have been amended. Claims 5, 7, 8, 18, 20, 21, 31, 33, and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 40-43 are new.

B. The Claims Are Not Anticipated By Kanai Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action mailed April 21, 2005, claims 1-3, 14-17, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,679 to Kanai et al. (hereinafter “Kanai”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

The standard for “anticipation” is one of fairly strict identity. To anticipate a claim of a patent, a single prior source must contain all the claimed essential elements. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 U.S.P.Q.81, 91 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Donahue*, 766 F.2d 531,226 U.S.P.Q. 619,621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Amended claim 1 describes a combination of features, including: “configuring a smart trigger table having a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising: a task identifier that identifies an FSO related processing task; a data set identifier that identifies an FSO related data set; and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger”. Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 19, line 22 through page 20, line 30. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest this feature of claim 1, in combination with the other features of the claim.

Kanai states:

The timings for the data arrangement determination unit to carry out the rearrangement of the data by determining the optimum data arrangement can be any one of the timings specified to the data arrangement determination unit by the operator, or prescribed timings with prescribed intervals, or the timings at

which the prescribed amount of the statistical information are acquired, or the timings at which the bias in the number of data accesses made by the transaction processors becomes recognizable from the statistical information, or the timings at which the bias in the load information for the transaction processors arises, or the timings specified by the transaction routing unit when the bias in the routed transaction processors arises.

(Kanai, col. 13, lines 19-31)

Kanai appears to teach using a data arrangement determination unit to carry out rearrangement of data based on an operator-specified timing, a prescribed interval, or certain other conditions. Kanai does not appear to teach or suggest a smart trigger table having a plurality of smart triggers, each of which comprises a task identifier that identifies an FSO related processing task, a data set identifier that identifies an FSO related data set; and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger.

Amended claim 1 further describes: “executing the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date”. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest this feature of claim 1, in combination with the other features of the claim.

Kanai states:

Then, the data arrangement determination unit obtains the optimum data arrangements by considering what arrangement of the data can make the loads on the transaction processors balanced and the cost required for processing each transaction can be lowered, according to the statistical information acquired from the data management units. The scheme for determining the data arrangement can be provided by the data arrangement scheme described in detail below as the third embodiment of the present invention.

(Kanai, col. 13, lines 1-10)

This data management unit 210 receives the data access requests from the transactions processed on the processor group 209, and produces and

updates the correlation information among a particular set of data indicating that the accesses have been made to all data in this particular set of data during a series of processings when it becomes possible for the history of the access request to satisfy the predetermined condition, such as when a predetermined number of access requests are received. In this manner, after the sufficient amount of correlation information is acquired, the new data arrangement information is produced according to the correlation information and the data storage information indicating the data storage regions in which the data are stored.

(Kanai, col. 37, lines 50-63)

Kanai appears to teach a data management unit producing data arrangement information when a sufficient amount of correlation information is acquired. Kanai does not appear to teach or suggest executing an FSO related processing task of a smart trigger to process the data contained in an FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of these claims.

Amended claim 14 describes a combination of features including: “configuring a smart trigger table having a plurality of smart triggers each of the smart triggers comprising: a first task identifier that identifies a Financial Service Organization (FSO) related processing task; and a data set identifier that identifies a FSO related data set; and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger” and “executing the first FSO related processing task of the smart trigger to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date.” For at least the

reasons discussed in reference to claim 1, Applicant submits that the combination of the cited art does not appear to teach or suggest all of the features of Applicant's claim 14 and the claims dependent thereon.

Amended claim 27 describes a combination of features including: "configuring a smart trigger table having a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising: a task identifier that identifies an FSO related processing task; a first data set identifier that identifies an FSO related data set; and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger" and "executing the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task to process the data contained in the FSO related data set of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date." For at least the reasons discussed in reference to claim 1, Applicant submits that the combination of the cited art does not appear to teach or suggest all of the features of Applicant's claim 27 and the claims dependent thereon.

Applicant submits that many of claims dependent on claims 1, 14, and 27 are separately patentable. For example, claim 12 recites: "wherein the FSO computer system further comprises a smart trigger processing task for processing the smart trigger table, wherein the smart trigger processing task is configurable to be executed periodically, wherein the scheduling of the period of execution is configurable by a user of the FSO computer system". Support for the amendment to claim 12 may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 20, lines 1-12, which state:

As one embodiment, the user may set up a Smart Trigger table for processing one or more accounts of an FSO data set on a particular scheduled date by assigning an associated task to be executed when certain pre-defined condition such as current date is equal to or greater than the scheduled date has been met. In step 501, the user of the FSO computer system may schedule a task to be executed at a user defined period to process the Smart Trigger table. In step 502, an evaluation may be made if certain predefined condition such as execution date and time for processing Smart Trigger task is equal to or greater than the current date and time has been met. If the scheduled conditions are met then the Smart Trigger table may be ready for processing in step 503. If the scheduled conditions have not been

met then step 502 will loop on itself. In step 503, the processing of the Smart Trigger table may be initiated by reading the first row of the Smart Trigger table.

The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted features of claim 12, in combination with the other features of the claim.

C. New Claims

New claim 40 describes a combination of features including:

providing a first set of data identifiers, each of the data identifiers corresponding to a physical storage location of a data set record;

building a list of associated data identifiers for each of a plurality of specific FSO related processing tasks, each of the lists including a subset of the first set of data identifiers;

wherein, for each FSO related processing task, the smart trigger table executes the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to an associated data identifier on the list for the specific FSO related processing task, but does execute the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to a data identifier on the list for the FSO related processing task.

Support for the new claim may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 21, lines 18-27. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted feature of claim 40, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 41 describes a combination of features including:

wherein the smart trigger table comprises a list of pointers to an account data set, wherein the smart trigger table includes:

an activity number associated with each of the pointers, wherein the activity numbers identify further processing of the account data set; and

activity data associated with each of the activities numbers, wherein the activity data is processed on a user specified schedule date

Support for the new claim may be found in Applicant's specification at least on page 17, lines 8-12. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted feature of claim 41, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 42 describes a combination of features including “wherein the associated processing task number is used to access an executable processing task name.” Support for the new claim may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 17, lines 8-13. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted feature of claim 42, in combination with the other features of the claim.

New claim 43 describes a combination of features including “wherein the activity number is used as a key to access an associated processing task number.” Support for the new claim may be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 17, lines 8-14. The cited art does not appear to teach or suggest at least the above-quoted feature of claim 43, in combination with the other features of the claim.

D. Additional Comments

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant has included a fee authorization for the filing of the request for continued examination. If an extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any additional fees are required, please appropriately charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5053-31001/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark R. Deluca
Reg. No. 44,649

Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8888 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 8/22/05